REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

Claim 8 is objected to due to lack of definition for the abbreviation PPS in the claim.

Claims 2-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2 as being indefinite due to in Claims 2-3 and 6 the word "type" in the recitation "dispersant type adhesives" being unclear, and due to in Claim 7 the term "mild" being used without definition anywhere.

Claims 1 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. (WO/2000/40424) in view of You (U.S. Pat. No. 5,904,761) and further in view of the "Paper Density" literature and the "BASF increases latex product prices" article.

Claims 2-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al., in view of You, further in view of the Paper Density literature and the article BASF increases latex product prices, and further in view of Turck (U.S. Pat. No. 3,976,626).

Claims 1 and 4-8 are pending in the application, with Claims 2-3 being canceled, Claims 1 and 7 being independent claims.

Claims 1 and 4-8 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the objection to Claim 8, the above amendments are believed to overcome the objection.

Regarding the rejection of Claims 2-3 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 2, the above amendments are believed to overcome the rejection.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Chang et al. in view of You, the Paper Density literature and the article BASF renders the claim obvious.

Chang et al. discloses a coated paper for printing having two or more coating layers mainly composed of white pigments and adhesives formed on at least one side of a base paper (Abstract; page 2, lines 2-14; Fig. 1), wherein pigment components of the outermost coating layer comprise white pigments, and adhesives of the outermost coating layer comprise polymer latex (page 5, lines 16-30; Fig. 1).

However, Chang et al. lacks at least the following limitations in Amended Claim 1.

First, Chang et al. hints nowhere the particle size and the preparation of polymer latex used as adhesives for the outermost coating layer. By contrast, the present invention teaches adhesives for the outermost coating layer include polymer latex having a particle size of 50 – 90 nm and prepared by copolymerization of monomer mixture containing 20 – 30 mass % of acrylonitrile

(specification, page 11, lines 11-29). Chang et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *adhesives of the outermost coating layer comprise polymer latex having a particle size of 50 – 90 nm and prepared by copolymerization of monomer mixture containing 20 – 30 mass % of acrylonitrile* taught by Amended Claim 1.

None of You, the Paper Density literature, and the BASF article discloses the above limitation of Amended Claim 1. Turck discloses coating adhesives such as latex particles in the range of 100 – 200 nm, which is greater than and beyond the range of 50 – 90 nm cited in Amended Claim 1, and no preparation for the latex particles cited in Amended Claim 1.

Second, Chang et al. is silent about particle size of the white pigments in the outermost coating layer. By contrast, the present invention teaches the particle size within a range of 0.1 – 1.3μm (specification, page 10, lines 13-18). Chang et al. further fails to disclose an other limitation of *pigment components of the outermost coating layer comprise white pigments having an average particle diameter within a range of 0.1 – 1.3μm* taught by Amended Claim 1.

None of the Paper Density literature and the BASF article discloses the other limitation in Amended Claim 1. You discloses a satin white pigment with a particle size of 0.3±0.1μm, which is different from, narrower than, and well within the particle size range of 0.1 – 1.3μm cited in Amended Claim 1.

Third, Change et al. does not teach the bulk density of the coated paper (Office Action, page 3, line 5 from bottom). Change et al. also fails to disclose a further limitation of *a coated paper for printing having a bulk density of 1.05g/cm^3 or less* taught by Amended Claim 1.

None of You and the BASF article discloses the further limitation in Amended Claim 1. The Paper Density literature discloses 0.69g/cm^3 as a typical density for pulp sheet, but not for a coated paper; Amended Claim 1 does cite a bulk density of 0.75 g/cm^3 or less for a base paper. So said density in the Paper Density is different from, narrower than, and well within the bulk density of 1.05g/cm^3 or less cited in Amended Claim 1 for a coated paper.

Thus, You, the Paper Density literature, the article BASF, or any combination thereof, fails to cure the defects of Chang et al.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Chang et al., You, the Paper Density literature, the BASF article, or any combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 7 with respect to Chang et al., You, the Paper Density literature, the article BASF, or any combination thereof.

In view of the preceding amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims, namely, Claims 1 and 4-8, are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance; he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,

Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27233